Reported issued being evaluated by the JFMM Board of Directors.

| Section | Problem |
|---|---|
| II-I-3.3.6.2.e;<br>II-I-3.3.6.3.a.1;<br>II-I-3.3.6.5.a.1;<br>II-I-3.4.1.C;<br>II-I-3.4.3.3.a;<br>II-I-3.4.3.3.b;<br>II-I-3.4.3.3.c;<br>II-I-3.4.3.3.d;<br>II-I-3.4.3.3.f;<br>II-I-3.4.3.3.g; | JFMM refers to SUPSHIP NN Code 1800. |
| II-I-3.6.8.1; | No clear definition of CNO availability completion. No standard way to delineate CNO availability completion. Definition implies after Sea Trails, but is not definitive. |
| II-I-3.b; VI-2.4.6;<br>VI-35B; | Due to mandated BRAC closure, South East Regional Maintenance Center (SCRMC) will be disestablished as of 01 October 2009. SCRMC will as such transfer Mine Warfare specific maintenance responsibility to the Southwest Regional Maintenance Center (SWRMC). SCRMC will relinquish all associated maintenance capability to SWRMC as of 01 June 2009 in order to facilitate facility closure. |
| II-I-3; | NAVSEAINST 7670.1- Navy Industrial Fund (NIF) Financial Management Systems and Procedures Manual. This reference is used in various places in the JFMM and is also reference in VII Chapter 4, APPENDIX 4-E. |
| II-I-3; II-I-4; | The time reference of less than or greater than 6 months is causing confusion as to what requirements you should follow based on the type of availability being performed.<br><br>EXAMPLE: A PIRA is a TYCOM availability that is scheduled to be 6 months or less in duration. Histories on last two PIRAs performed at PNSY were actually scheduled for 9.5 to 10 months. So this leads you to which requirements do you follow. The requirements for a PIRA availability or an availability of 6 months or greater. |
| II-I-3BO; | The subject appendix has incorrect references listed in paragraphs 4 and 6. |
| II-I-3BO; | Templated msg does not contain all the references applicable for maintenance of certification. |
| II-I-3BP; II-I-3CR; | Templated messages for "greater than" and "less than" six month availabilities are confusing. A sequence guide is necessary to ease understanding of |

Reported issued being evaluated by the JFMM Board of Directors.

| | |
|---|---|
| | the goal and process with completing certification of scheduled availabilities. |
| II-I-3CG; | Templated msg does not contain all the references applicable for maintenance of certification. |
| II-I-3D3; | Templated msg does not contain all the references applicable for maintenance of certification. |
| II-II-1A; | JFMM Rev A CH-5 deleted three “Availability Category Codes” in Appendix A (II-II-1A-1/2). As a result the numbering system for the remaining “Availability Category Codes” changed which would result in disconnect with existing codes in the historical data base. |
| IV-10.4.2.b; | Paragraph 10.4.2.b identifies the wrong paragraph for SOSMIL. |
| IV-10.5.3; IV-10H; | The subject chapter has various errors regarding tank close out. |
| IV-10A; | The JFMM does not clearly state what to enter in WAF block 15 to void (cancel) a WAF when none of the work described in WAF block 7 was started, e.g. the work was canceled, will be transferred to another repair activity or to Ship’s Force for accomplishment, or will not be accomplished because the system must be restored to meet ship’s operations requirement / commitment. |
| IV-10A; | Unused blocks should be marked “N/A”. |
| IV-10E; IV-10F; | The current example and blank form under Review and approval (all parties must sign), lists the Squadron Rep. A recent audit has caused some confusion as to whether the ISIC representative NSSC Bangor is authorized to sign the Squadron Rep block for review and approval. |
| IV-2.1.1; | Periodicity for accomplishment of FMAA’s is too frequent. Current periodicity (12-18 months) was based on audit of SIMA’s where enlisted personnel turnover was annual.<br>This change falls more in line with and will have no adverse impact on outside activity assessments of the RMCs. |
| IV-2.5.c; | There are conflicting requirements in 2.5. 2.5.c stated “…submit a findings status report to the TYCOM via the administrative<br>chain of command within 60 days following the date of the official assessment report.”<br>2.5.2 stated: “…deficiencies and must be<br>corrected within 60 days following receipt of the official assessment report.” |

Reported issued being evaluated by the JFMM Board of Directors.

| | |
|---|---|
| V-I-11 QA Form 11; | Change request 1810-06 for JFMM Change 6 unfortunately revised the instructions for the QA-11 and deleted the exception for the use of buddy RECs during CNO avails. |
| V-I-11 QA Form 34; | NAVSEA has revised the requirements for the acceptability of stud rotation during installation and use thereafter. |
| V-I-11 QA Form 34; | The JFMM does not provide for positive identification on a QA-34 when a “Controlled Assembly” is being documented. |
| V-I-2.2.1; | The list of maintenance actions shown in paragraph 2.2.1 adds no value in determining the type of TWD necessary to effect first-time quality maintenance, and adds confusion in that the reader could be led to understand a maintenance action not listed in paragraph 2.2.1 requires no TWD. |
| V-I-2.2.4.b(7); | The Commanding Officer should have a real time direct input to reactor plant testing that has the potential for serious damage. |
| V-I-2.2.4.d(1); | The existing words do not convey the original intent which predate the JFMM. Several words appear to have been inadvertently dropped out of the cited para. There is and has always been a requirement to document piping joints brazed or welded that contain Freon. This issue came to light because a Fleet activity questioned the requirement. |
| VI-21E; | The listed APL in Appendix E does not match the APL listed in OMMS-NG. Appendix E gives an APL of "-09066045 (ASB-49)" and OMMS-NG has an APL of "09066045 (ASB-49)". |
| V-I-2C; | The Formal Work Package Approval/Revision Sheet, Page V-I-2c-1 has no formal instructions associated with it. There is one issue which continues to be an area of question in the Fleet. The “CHOP FOR FURTHER USE “ Block has no explanation for its purpose. FMSB has received verbal guidance in the past that the purpose is for the RADCON OFFICER/CRA to identify whether FWPs being used as Standardized FWPs require their review prior to subsequent use. Fleet personnel continue to ask FMSB where that is written. |
| VI-35.5.2.10; | JFMM is incorrect and impacts duties of Regional Maintenance Center (RMC) Process Improvement Offices. JFMM does not have Code of RMC Process Improvement Office and has an inaccurate description of their duties. |

Reported issued being evaluated by the JFMM Board of Directors.

| | |
|---|---|
| VI-3C; | The format letter for ISIC forwarding of RPCCRs has ANSTR Schenectady listed in the distribution section. Naval Reactors has requested that we no longer forward RPCCRs to ANSTR Schenectady because the logistics support group is no longer going to be stationed at that location. |
| V-I-5.1; | The original prohibition cited was inadequate. The intent of 5.4-5.7 was to consolidate information not available to activities outside the submarine force. However, they are still expected to use the applicable references in the execution of maintenance. |
| V-I-5.10.2 ; | SUBSAFEGRAMs clarify and guide, they are considered to be within the scope of SUBSAFE Program direction provided by NAVSEA 0924-062-0010, Submarine Safety (SUBSAFE) Requirements Manual. SUBSAFE grams do not always integrate with the process specified in the JFMM and this has lead to actions on part of ISICs and Ships which do not conform to the process and requirements of the JFMM. |
| V-I-5.10.3; | Para. 5.10.3 currently reads; “When Re-Entry of a nuclear SUBSAFE system or a portion of a nuclear SUBSAFE system is necessary, the applicable Reactor Plant Manual, reference (s), and the ship’s specific Reactor Work Accomplishment Report (RPWAR) will be reviewed and used to provide technical guidance.” Reference (s) is NAVSEAINST 9210.41 All Naval Nuclear Propulsion Plants – Use of Standard Lubricants and Penetrating Fluid; Requirements for. Believe correct reference should be reference (e), NAVSEA 0989-LP-037-2000. |
| V-I-5.10.4.b (18); | This para invokes the requirement for a SF Buddy REC. COMSUBPAC Message R I181514Z OCT 96 addresses lessons learned/requirements to ensure a ship does not get underway with an outside activity having an open REC. A SF Buddy REC system was initiated for SF to track all SUBSAFE work by outside activities. Para 3 of this message specifically excluded 'The use of the Buddy REC number is NOT required for CNO/TYCOM scheduled availabilities." As written a BUDDY REC would be required for all Depot level work, this was not the intent of the SF Buddy REC System. This para was added in Rev A Change (-) and exists in all versions prior to Rev (-) Change 5. JFMM currently does not provide SF responsibilities with completion of Buddy REC, recommend guidance |

Reported issued being evaluated by the JFMM Board of Directors.

| | |
|---|---|
| | from subject SUBPAC MSG R ISISI4Z OCT 96 be incorporated to clarify that SF Buddy Record is an administrative tool to make log easier and ensure the required certification letters are received before underway. When SF issues a Buddy REC during non-CNO availabilities no SF REC is issued and there is no requirement for SF to be involved in the assigned activities work certification process. |
| V-I-5.10.5.d; | No problem description provided. |
| V-I-5.10.7; | Recertification Testing column on Table 5-14 in para. 5.10.7 of Vol. V, Chapter 5, is titled “Recertification Testing.” Many of these say “None.” This has caused some confusion and tends to be misleading to users who see this and believe that there is absolutely no retests that have to be done because column three states “None.” |
| V-I-5.10.8.b; | Last line states "Voyage repair periods and availability planning periods are not considered FMA availabilities." For SSGNs as required by a separate MOA between COMSUBLANT, COMSUBPAC and COMNAVSPECWARCOM the deployed maintenance periods are called "Voyage Repair Periods" which is an FMA availability. Reference to voyage repair periods in the MOA is not likely to change. |
| V-I-5.10; | This section deals with Subsafe re-entry controls and Reactor Plant Work Accomplishment Reports. Students from several Submarine QAI course (A-652-0085) have commented verbally that this section seems out of place |
| V-I-6.3.4.5.q | As part of the receipt inspection process, the subject paragraph requires the Ship’s Force CMPO to verify the component has a MIC marking. If the component has a shortened MIC marking, ensure the full MIC marking is available on the shipping documents, tags, and/or packaging.<br>Ship’s Force continues to get fasteners from the Supply system which do not include a full MIC number on the part or the packaging (they have the PNSY trace code only, without material designator), and cannot satisfactorily complete the receipt inspection process. |
| VI-7.1; VI-7C; | NAVSEA 05 created a guide to assist sailor preserving submarine interiors and minimize waste. |
| V-I-7.3.1; | The reference MIL-H-904J “MILITARY SPECIFICATION, HOISTS, CHAIN, |

Reported issued being evaluated by the JFMM Board of Directors.

| | |
|---|---|
| | HAND-OPERATED, HOOK AND TROLLEY SUSPENSION" is no longer active. |
| V-I-8.3.10 d (2) (b);<br>V-I-8.3.10 d (2) (c); | Paragraphs 8.3.10 d (2) (b) and (c) are incorrect.<br>(b) If a non-conformance is unarchived to allow TYCOMs or agency users to make changes, change will be accomplished in accordance with the requirement cited in paragraph 8.3.9.c. above.<br>(c) Each signatory level user should indicate their concurrence to the change in accordance with the requirement cited in paragraph 8.3.9.c. above.<br>Paragraph 8.3.9 c is now 8.3.10 c. |
| V-I-8.3.10 d (2) (b);<br>V-I-8.3.10 d (2) (c); | Paragraphs 8.3.10 d (2) (b) and (c) and 8.3.10.d (3) (b) are incorrect.<br><br>Paragraphs 8.3.10.d (2) (b) & (c)<br>(b) If a non-conformance is unarchived to allow TYCOMs or agency users to make changes, change will be accomplished in accordance with the requirement cited in paragraph 8.3.9.c. above.<br>(c) Each signatory level user should indicate their concurrence to the change in accordance with the requirement cited in paragraph 8.3.9.c. above.<br>Paragraph 8.3.10.d (3) (b)<br>(b) If a non-conformance is unarchived to allow a TYCOM or agency user to make changes, change will be accomplished in accordance with the requirement cited in paragraph 8.3.9.c. above.<br>Paragraph 8.3.9 c is now 8.3.10 c. |
| V-I-8.3.10.b; | The requirement is for all attachments to the electronic non-conformance to be in Adobe Acrobat .pdf format. |
| VI-9.7.1 | Confusion exists on proper method of completing and submitting TMDERs for CRL validation. |
| V-I-FWD-B; | Definition of breakaway torque inconsistent with NSTM 75 definition of "The torque required to start the rotation of a fastener. The magnitude of this torque is significant when checking the bonding of an anaerobic locking compound. The term is also used to describe the torque required to start the traction of a fastener when loosening it or restarting its rotation when tightening a group of fasteners in successive increments. Breakaway torque will always be higher than that required to continue the rotation." Definition is also inconsistent with some common usage of the term "breakaway torque. (Frequently breakaway torque is defined as "the torque necessary to put into reverse rotation a bolt that has not been tightened".) |

Reported issued being evaluated by the JFMM Board of Directors.

| | |
|---|---|
| | Additionally “breakloose torque” definition not provided. "Breakloose torque" sometimes used to define torque required to initially move an axially loaded bolt. |
| V-I-FWD-B; | Definition of Technical Work Document in the Glossary of Terms is misleading in that the reader could be led to understand a Technical Work Document as something different (a document to provide requirements for generating work procedures) than the work procedure itself (MP, FWP, CWP). |
| VII-11.5.6.1; VII-11.5.6.2; VII-11A; | Contractor corrective action request language does not align with ISO 9001:2000 Para 8.5 verbage. |
| V-III-5.11.4; | Deep dive Test process for SOC does not meet the desire of the NAVSEA tech warrant. The existing process was developed by the Fleet in the absence of specific guidance in NAVSEA source documents. PMS 399 has generated MCRs to revise source documents to capture the current technical requirements cited in this change. |